

Single-Index Model-Assisted Estimation In Survey Sampling

Li Wang

University of Georgia

Abstract: A model-assisted semiparametric method of estimating finite population totals is investigated to improve the precision of survey estimators by incorporating multivariate auxiliary information. The proposed superpopulation model is a single-index model which has proven to be a simple and efficient semiparametric tool in multivariate regression. A class of estimators based on polynomial spline regression is proposed. These estimators are robust against deviation from single-index models. Under standard design conditions, the proposed estimators are asymptotically design-unbiased, consistent and asymptotically normal. An iterative optimization routine is provided that is sufficiently fast for users to analyze large and complex survey data within seconds. The proposed method has been applied to simulated datasets and MU281 dataset, which have provided strong evidence that corroborates with the asymptotic theory.

Key words and phrases: Horvitz-Thompson estimator; model-assisted estimation; semiparametric; spline smoothing; superpopulation.

1 Introduction

In this article, the classic finite-population estimation problem is investigated. In what follows, let $U_N = \{1, \dots, i, \dots, N\}$ denote the N units of finite population. For each $i \in U_N$, let y_i be a generic characteristic and the objective is to estimate $t_y = \sum_{i \in U_N} y_i$. A probability sample s is drawn from U_N according to a fixed sampling design $p_N(\cdot)$, where $p_N(s)$ is the probability of drawing the sample s . Let $\pi_{iN} \equiv \pi_i = \Pr\{i \in s\} = \sum_{s \ni i} p_N(s)$ denote the inclusion probability for element $i \in U_N$ and $\pi_{ijN} \equiv \pi_{ij} = \Pr\{i, j \in s\} = \sum_{s \ni i, j} p_N(s)$ denote the inclusion probability for element $i, j \in U_N$.

If no information other than the inclusion probabilities is used to estimate t_y , a well-known design unbiased estimator is the Horvitz-Thompson estimator

$$\hat{t}_{y\pi} \equiv \hat{t}_y = \sum_{i \in s} \frac{y_i}{\pi_i}. \quad (1.1)$$

The variance of the Horvitz-Thompson estimator under the sampling design is

$$\text{Var}_p(\hat{t}_y) = \sum_{i, j \in U_N} (\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j) \frac{y_i}{\pi_i} \frac{y_j}{\pi_j}.$$

Address for correspondence: Li Wang, Department of Statistics, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 30602, USA. E-mail: lilywang@uga.edu

The efficiency of the Horvitz-Thompson estimator can be significantly improved by incorporating some “cheap” auxiliary information at the population level in addition to sample data. Such auxiliary information is often available for all elements of the population of interest in many surveys. For instance, in many countries, administrative registers provide extensive sources of auxiliary information. Complete registers can give access to variables such as sex, age, income and country of birth. Studies of labor force characteristics or household expenditure patterns, for example, might benefit from these auxiliary data. Another example is the satellite images or GPS data used in spatial sampling. These data are often collected at the population level, which are often available at little or no extra cost, especially compared to the cost of collecting the survey data. For more examples of auxiliary information, see [5, 7, 12, 13]. Use of auxiliary information to improve the accuracy of survey estimators actually dates back to post-stratification, calibration, ratio and regression estimation; see [6, 8, 28, 32] for a general review of these methods. Auxiliary information can also be used to increase the accuracy of the finite population distribution function, for example, [33].

In this article, let $\mathbf{x}_i = \{x_{i1}, \dots, x_{id}\}$ be a d -dimensional auxiliary variable vector, $i \in U_N$, and assume that $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i \in U_N}$ is a realization of $(\mathbf{X}, Y)$ from an infinite superpopulation, ξ , satisfying

$$Y = m(\mathbf{X}) + \sigma(\mathbf{X})\varepsilon, \quad (1.2)$$

in which the d -variate function m is the unknown mean function of Y conditional on the auxiliary information vector $\mathbf{X}$, often is assumed to be smooth; σ is the unknown standard deviation function. The standard error satisfies that $E_\xi(\varepsilon|\mathbf{X}) = 0$ and $E_\xi(\varepsilon^2|\mathbf{X}) = 1$, where E_ξ is the expectation with respect to the population ξ . The interesting problem is how to take advantage of the regression relationship (1.2) to better estimate t_y .

The traditional parametric approach to analyze a regression relationship assumes that the superpopulation model is fully described by a finite set of parameters, for example, the linear regression estimator discussed in [28]. However, it sometimes requires prohibitively complex models with a very large number of parameters to address various hypotheses. It is very difficult to obtain any prior model information about the regression function m in (1.2), and substantial estimation bias can result if a preselected parametric model is too restricted to fit unexpected features. As an alternative one can try to estimate the unknown regression relationships nonparametrically without reference to a specific form. The flexibility of nonparametric smoothing/regression is extremely helpful in exploratory data analysis as well as in obtaining robust predictions, see [15, 18] for details.

Nonparametric methods for survey data are rather sparse and have begun to emerge as important and practical tools, see [1, 2, 26, 27, 38, 39]. Reference [1] first proposed a nonparametric model-assisted estimator based on local polynomial regression, which generalized the

parametric framework in survey sampling and improved the precision of the survey estimators. Their investigation is restricted to the scalar case, i.e., $d = 1$. Nowadays most surveys involve more than one auxiliary variable (reference [29]). For example, the auxiliary information obtained from remote sensing data, satellite images and GPS data provide a wide and growing range of variables to be employed in spatial sampling. Northeastern lakes survey discussed in [3, 14] is a good example of this. In that study, a lot of information, such as longitude, latitude, and elevation, of every lake in the population is known for the Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In addition, the growing possibilities of information and communication technology have made it possible to develop very large and complex surveys. In this article, a d -dimensional auxiliary vector is considered to improve the efficiency of estimating t_y for both small and large surveys.

Research in nonparametric survey theory and methodology when the dimension of the auxiliary information vector is high, however, is quite challenging. A key difficulty is due to the issue of “curse of dimensionality”: the optimal rate of convergence decreases with dimensionality ([31]). One solution is regression in the form of additive model popularized by [20]; see [2, 3, 27] for possible application of additive model to survey sampling. A weakness of the purely additive model is that interactions between the explanatory variables are completely ignored ([30]). An attractive alternative to additive model is the single-index model given in (2.1). Similar to the first step of projection pursuit regression, single-index model reduces dimensionality but does not incorporate interactions; see [4, 17, 19, 21, 36] for instance. The basic appeal of single-index model is that it is in nature a hybrid method of parametric and nonparametric regression. It preserves the simplicity of parametric regression where simplicity is sufficient: the d -variate function $m(\mathbf{x}) = m(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ is expressed as a univariate function of $\mathbf{x}^T \theta_0 = \sum_{q=1}^d x_q \theta_{0,q}$; it also employs the flexibility of nonparametric regression where flexibility is necessary.

In this article, I investigate the single-index model-assisted estimator for the finite population total, that is, the superpopulation model in (1.2) is assumed to be a SIM. Under standard design conditions, a design-consistent estimator of θ_0 has been obtained using polynomial splines, and the proposed estimator of t_y is asymptotically design-unbiased, consistent and asymptotically normal. By taking advantage of the spline smoothing and iterative optimization routines, the proposed method is particularly computationally efficient comparing to the kernel additive model approaches in the literature of nonparametric survey estimation, in which iterative approaches such as a backfitting algorithm ([3, 20]) or marginal integration ([25]) are necessary. The rest of the article is organized as follows. Section 2 gives details of the model specification and the proposed method of estimation. Section 3 describes some nice properties of the estimator. Section 4 provides the actual procedure to implement the method.

Section 5 reports the empirical results. All technical proofs are contained in Appendices A and B.

2 Superpopulation Model and Proposed Estimator

2.1 Single-index superpopulation model

In this article, the proposed superpopulation model ξ in (1.2) is a single-index model (SIM), where

$$Y = m(\mathbf{X}^T \theta_0) + \sigma(\mathbf{X}) \varepsilon, \quad (2.1)$$

where the unknown parameter θ_0 is called the single-index coefficient, used for simple interpretation once estimated; function m is an unknown smooth function used for further data summary.

If the SIM is misspecified, however, a goodness-of-fit test is necessary and the estimation of θ_0 must be rethought; see [35]. So in this article, instead of presuming that the underlying true function m is a single-index function like the one defined in (2.1), the single-index is identified by the best approximation to the multivariate function m . Specifically, a univariate function g is estimated that optimally approximates the multivariate function m in the sense of

$$g(\nu) = E_\xi [m(\mathbf{X}) | \mathbf{X}^T \theta_0 = \nu]. \quad (2.2)$$

The superiority of this method is that it works very well even under model misspecification so that it is much more useful in applications than the traditional SIMs given in (2.1).

For the superpopulation model defined by (1.2) and (2.2), let

$$m_\theta(\mathbf{X}^T \theta) = E_\xi [Y | \mathbf{X}^T \theta] = E_\xi [m(\mathbf{X}) | \mathbf{X}^T \theta]$$

for any fixed θ , where as noted in the introduction, E_ξ denotes the expected value with respect to the population ξ in (1.2) and (2.2). Define the risk function of θ as

$$R(\theta) = E_\xi [\{Y - m_\theta(\mathbf{X}^T \theta)\}^2] = E_\xi \{m(\mathbf{X}) - m_\theta(\mathbf{X}^T \theta)\}^2 + E_\xi \sigma^2(\mathbf{X}), \quad (2.3)$$

which is uniquely minimized at $\theta_0 \in S_+^{d-1} = \{(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d) | \sum_{q=1}^d \theta_q^2 = 1, \theta_d > 0\}$.

Remark 2.1: It is obvious that without constraints, the coefficient vector θ_0 is identified only up to a constant factor. Typically, one requires that $\|\theta_0\| = 1$ which entails that at least one of the coordinates $\theta_{0,1}, \dots, \theta_{0,d}$ is nonzero. One could assume without loss of generality that $\theta_{0,d} > 0$, and the candidate θ_0 would then belong to the upper unit hemisphere S_+^{d-1} .

2.2 Spline smoothing

Estimation of both θ_0 and $g(\cdot)$ in model (2.2) requires a degree of statistical smoothing. In this article, all estimation is carried out via polynomial splines. The use of polynomial spline smoothing in the generalized nonparametric models can be back to [31]. As pointed out in [2, 34], one of the important advantages of spline smoothing is the relative ease with which spline estimators can be simply computed, even for large datasets or datasets with regions of sparse data. In addition, spline smoothing is a global smoothing method. After the spline basis is chosen, the coefficients can be estimated by an efficient optimization procedure. In contrast, kernel based methods such as the kernel based backfitting ([3, 20]) and marginal integration approaches ([25]), in which the maximizing has to be conducted repeatedly at every local data points, are very time-consuming.

To introduce the function space of splines of order p , one pre-selects an integer $N^{1/6} \ll J = J_N \ll N^{1/5} (\log N)^{-2/5}$, see Assumption (A4) below, and divides $[0, 1]$ into $(J + 1)$ subintervals, $[k_j, k_{j+1})$, $j = 0, \dots, J - 1$, $[k_J, 1]$, where $\{k_j\}_{j=1}^J$ is a sequence of equally-spaced points, called interior knots, given as

$$k_{1-p} = \dots = k_{-1} = k_0 = 0 < k_1 < \dots < k_J < 1 = k_{J+1} = \dots = k_{J+p},$$

in which $k_j = j/(J + 1)$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, J + 1$. The j -th B-spline of order p denoted by $B_{j,p}$ is recursively defined by [10]. In the following, let $\Phi^{(2)} = \Phi^{(2)}[0, 1]$ be the space of all the second order smoothness functions that are polynomials of degree 3 on each subinterval.

Direct calculation shows that under Assumption (A1) in Section 3.2, for any $\theta \in S_+^{d-1}$, the variable $\mathbf{X}^T \theta$ has a Lebesgue probability density function (pdf) that is uniformly bounded below and above by the pdf of a rescaled centered Beta $\{(d + 1)/2, (d + 1)/2\}$,

$$f_d(\nu) = \frac{\Gamma(d + 1)}{\Gamma\{(d + 1)/2\}^2 2^d a} (1 - \nu^2/a^2)^{(d-1)/2} I_{[-a, a]}(\nu),$$

which vanishes at boundary points $-a$ and a . This makes nonparametric smoothing of Y on $\mathbf{X}^T \theta$ difficult. I therefore first transform the variable $\mathbf{X}^T \theta$ by using the cumulative distribution function F_d of f_d

$$F_d(\nu) = \int_{-1}^{\nu/a} \frac{\Gamma(d + 1)}{\Gamma\{(d + 1)/2\}^2 2^d} (1 - t^2)^{(d-1)/2} dt, \nu \in [-a, a]. \quad (2.4)$$

For the rest of the article, denote the transformed variable of the single-index variable $X^T \theta$ by Z_θ and let φ_θ be the conditional expectation of m given the transformed variable Z_θ , i.e.

$$\varphi_\theta(Z_\theta) = E_\xi \{m(\mathbf{X}) | Z_\theta\} = E_\xi \{m(\mathbf{X}) | X^T \theta\} = m_\theta(X^T \theta), \quad (2.5)$$

Remark 2.2: The transformed variable, Z_θ , has a quasi-uniform $[0, 1]$ distribution, i.e., the pdf of the transformed variable is supported on $[0, 1]$ with positive lower bound. In practice, the radius a can take the value of the $100(1 - \alpha)$ percentile of $\{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|\}_{i \in U_N}$, for example, $\alpha = 0.05$.

2.3 “Oracle” population-based estimator

If the entire realization were known by “oracle”, one can create an “oracle” estimator to estimate θ_0 and g in (2.2) through a profile least-squares method. One first estimates the single-index coefficient θ_0 by a consistent estimator $\tilde{\theta}$ via minimizing the empirical version of the risk function $R(\theta)$ defined in (2.3), i.e.

$$\tilde{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta \in S_+^{d-1}} \tilde{R}(\theta). \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$\tilde{R}(\theta) = N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \{y_i - \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i})\}^2, \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$\tilde{\varphi}_\theta(\cdot) = \arg \min_{\varphi(\cdot) \in \Phi^{(2)}[0,1]} \sum_{i \in U_N} \{y_i - \varphi(z_{\theta i})\}^2. \quad (2.8)$$

Then the link function g can be estimated by $\tilde{g}$, a cubic spline smoother of $\{y_i\}$ on $\{z_{\tilde{\theta} i}\}$, i.e., $\tilde{g}(\nu) = \tilde{\varphi}_{\tilde{\theta}}(F_d(\nu))$, where $F_d(\cdot)$ is defined in (2.4). Thus the best single-index approximation to $m(\mathbf{x})$ is $\tilde{m}(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{g}(\mathbf{x}^T \tilde{\theta}) = \tilde{\varphi}_{\tilde{\theta}}(z_{\tilde{\theta}})$.

Let $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N)^T$, $\mathbf{B}_\theta = \{B_{j,4}(z_{\theta i})\}_{i \in U_N, j=-3, \dots, J}$ be the B-spline matrix for any fixed θ and $\mathbf{e}_i$ be a N -vector with a 1 in the i th position and 0 elsewhere. Write

$$\tilde{m}_i = \tilde{g}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \tilde{\theta}) = \tilde{\varphi}_{\tilde{\theta}}(z_{\tilde{\theta} i}) = \mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\theta}} (\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\theta}}^T \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\theta}})^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\theta}}^T \mathbf{y}. \quad (2.9)$$

Clearly, $\tilde{m}_i$ is the spline single-index prediction at $\mathbf{x}_i$ based on the entire finite population. If these pseudo predictions $\tilde{m}_i$ were known, then a design-unbiased estimator of t_y would be the generalized difference estimator

$$\tilde{t}_{y, \text{diff}} = \sum_{i \in s} \frac{y_i - \tilde{m}_i}{\pi_i} + \sum_{i \in U_N} \tilde{m}_i, \quad (2.10)$$

as given on page 221 of reference [28]. The design variance of $\tilde{t}_{y, \text{diff}}$ in (2.10) is

$$\text{Var}_p(\tilde{t}_{y, \text{diff}}) = \sum_{i, j \in U_N} (\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j) \frac{y_i - \tilde{m}_i}{\pi_i} \frac{y_j - \tilde{m}_j}{\pi_j}.$$

2.4 Sample-based estimator

However, the predictions $\tilde{m}_i$ for $m(\mathbf{x}_i)$ can not be computed directly from data, because the only y_i 's observed are those with $i \in s$. Therefore, each $\tilde{m}_i$ needs to be replaced by a sample-based consistent estimator. For any fixed θ , the sample based cubic spline estimator $\hat{\varphi}_\theta$ of φ_θ in (2.5) is defined as

$$\hat{\varphi}_\theta(\cdot) = \arg \min_{\varphi(\cdot) \in \Phi^{(2)}[0,1]} \sum_{i \in s} \pi_i^{-1} \{y_i - \varphi(z_{\theta i})\}^2. \quad (2.11)$$

Define the sample-based empirical risk function of θ

$$\hat{R}(\theta) = N^{-1} \sum_{i \in s} \pi_i^{-1} \{y_i - \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i})\}^2, \quad (2.12)$$

then the sample design-based spline estimator of θ_0 is defined as

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta \in S_+^{d-1}} \hat{R}(\theta), \quad (2.13)$$

and the spline estimator of g is $\hat{g}$, i.e., $\hat{g}(v) = \hat{\varphi}_{\hat{\theta}}(F_d(v))$. For any $i \in s$, let

$$\hat{m}_i = \hat{g}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\theta}) = \hat{\varphi}_{\hat{\theta}}(z_{\hat{\theta} i}) = \mathbf{e}_i^T \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}, s} \left(\mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}, s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}, s} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}, s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{y}_s, \quad (2.14)$$

where $\mathbf{y}_s = \{y_i\}_{i \in s}$ is the n_N -vector of y_i obtained in the sample and

$$\mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}, s} = \{B_{j,4}(z_{\hat{\theta} i})\}_{i \in s, j=-3, \dots, J}, \mathbf{W}_s = \text{diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{\pi_i} \right\}_{i \in s}.$$

Then the sample design-based B-spline estimator of t_y is

$$\hat{t}_{y, \text{diff}} = \sum_{i \in s} \frac{y_i - \hat{m}_i}{\pi_i} + \sum_{i \in U_N} \hat{m}_i. \quad (2.15)$$

3 Properties of the estimator

3.1 A simple alternative expression for the estimator

Like the ratio and linear regression estimators ([28]) and the penalized spline estimators ([2]), the B-spline estimator defined in (2.15) can also be represented in a simple form. Let $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_z$ and $\hat{\mathbf{t}}_{z\pi}$ be two vectors:

$$\hat{\mathbf{t}}_z = \left\{ \sum_{i \in U_N} B_{j,4}(z_{\hat{\theta} i}) \right\}_{j=-3, \dots, J}^T, \quad \hat{\mathbf{t}}_{z\pi} = \left\{ \sum_{i \in s} \pi_i^{-1} B_{j,4}(z_{\hat{\theta} i}) \right\}_{j=-3, \dots, J}^T.$$

Then the estimator in (2.15) can be written as $\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}} = \hat{t}_y + (\hat{\mathbf{t}}_z - \hat{\mathbf{t}}_{z\pi}) \hat{\gamma}$, where

$$\hat{\gamma} = \left(\mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta},s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta},s} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta},s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{y}_s.$$

Noting that $(1, \dots, 1)_{J+4} \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta},s}^T = (1, \dots, 1)_{n_N}$ and

$$\left\{ \sum_{i \in s} \pi_i^{-1} B_{j,4}(z_{\hat{\theta}i}) \right\}_{j=-3, \dots, J}^T = (1, \dots, 1)_{J+4} \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta},s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta},s},$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{t}}_{z\pi} \hat{\gamma} &= \left\{ \sum_{i \in s} \pi_i^{-1} B_{j,4}(z_{\hat{\theta}i}) \right\}_{j=-3, \dots, J}^T \left(\mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta},s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta},s} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta},s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{y}_s \\ &= (1, \dots, 1)_{J+4} \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta},s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{y}_s = (1, \dots, 1)_{n_N} \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{y}_s = \hat{t}_y. \end{aligned}$$

So the proposed estimator takes the simple and attractive form: $\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}} = \hat{\mathbf{t}}_z \hat{\gamma} = \sum_{i \in U_N} \hat{m}_i$.

3.2 Assumptions

I will use the traditional asymptotic framework given in reference [1, 23], in which both the population and sample sizes increase as $N \rightarrow \infty$. There are two sources of “variation” to be considered here. The first is introduced by the random sample design and the corresponding measure is denoted by p . The “with p -probability 1”, “ O_p ”, “ o_p ” and “ $E_p(\cdot)$ ” notation below is with respect to this measure. The second is associated with the superpopulation from which the finite population is viewed as a sample. The corresponding measure and notation are “ ξ ”, “with ξ -probability 1”, “ O_ξ ”, “ o_ξ ” and “ $E_\xi(\cdot)$ ”.

Before stating the asymptotic properties of the estimators, we need some assumptions. Let $B_a^d = \{\mathbf{x} \in R^d \mid \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq a\}$ be the d -dimensional ball with radius a , center $\mathbf{0}$ and volume $\text{Vol}_d(B_a^d)$. Let

$$C^{(k)}(B_a^d) = \left\{ m \mid \text{the } k\text{-th order partial derivatives of } m \text{ are continuous on } B_a^d \right\}$$

be the space of k -th order smooth functions. Before stating the asymptotic results, I formulate some assumptions:

(A1) *The density function of $\mathbf{X}$, $f(\mathbf{x}) \in C^{(4)}(B_a^d)$ for some $a > 0$, and there are positive constants $c_f \leq C_f$ such that $c_f/\text{Vol}_d(B_a^d) \leq f(\mathbf{x}) \leq C_f/\text{Vol}_d(B_a^d)$, if $\mathbf{x} \in B_a^d$ and $f(\mathbf{x}) = 0, \mathbf{x} \notin B_a^d$.*

(A2) *The regression function in (1.2) $m \in C^{(4)}(B_a^d)$.*

(A3) The error ε in (1.2) satisfies $E_\xi(\varepsilon|\mathbf{X}) = 0$, $E_\xi(\varepsilon^2|\mathbf{X}) = 1$ and there exists a positive constant M such that $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_a^d} E_\xi(|\varepsilon|^3|\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) < M$. The standard deviation function $\sigma(\mathbf{x})$ is continuous on B_a^d , $0 < c_\sigma \leq \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in B_a^d} \sigma(\mathbf{x}) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in B_a^d} \sigma(\mathbf{x}) \leq C_\sigma < \infty$.

(A4) As $N \rightarrow \infty$, $n_N N^{-1} \rightarrow \pi \in (0, 1)$ and the number of interior knots J_N satisfies: $n_N^{1/6} \ll J_N \ll n_N^{1/5} \{\log(n_N)\}^{-2/5}$.

(A5) For all N , $\min_{i \in U_N} \pi_i \geq \lambda > 0$, $\min_{i,j \in U_N} \pi_{ij} \geq \lambda^* > 0$ and

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} n_N \max_{i,j \in U_N, i \neq j} |\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j| < \infty.$$

(A6) Let $D_{k,N}$ be the set of all distinct k -tuples $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k)$ from U_N ,

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} n_N^2 \max_{(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) \in D_{4,N}} |E_p[(I_{i_1} - \pi_{i_1})(I_{i_2} - \pi_{i_2})(I_{i_3} - \pi_{i_3})(I_{i_4} - \pi_{i_4})]| < \infty,$$

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} n_N^2 \max_{(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) \in D_{4,N}} |E_p[(I_{i_1} I_{i_2} - \pi_{i_1 i_2})(I_{i_3} I_{i_4} - \pi_{i_3 i_4})]| < \infty,$$

and

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} n_N^2 \max_{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \in D_{3,N}} |E_p[(I_{i_1} - \pi_{i_1})^2 (I_{i_2} - \pi_{i_2})(I_{i_3} - \pi_{i_3})]| < \infty,$$

where $I_i = 1$ if $i \in s$ and $I_i = 0$ otherwise.

(A7) The risk function $\tilde{R}$ in (2.7) is locally convex at $\tilde{\theta}$: $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \delta > 0$ such that $\|\theta - \tilde{\theta}\|_2 < \varepsilon$ if $\tilde{R}(\theta) - \tilde{R}(\tilde{\theta}) < \delta$.

(A8) The second order partial derivative of the risk function, $\tilde{R}(\theta)$, is bounded at $\theta = \tilde{\theta}$.

Remark 3.1: Assumptions (A1)-(A3) are typical in the nonparametric smoothing literature, see for instance, [15, 18, 36]. Assumptions (A4) is about how to choose the number of knots in order to achieve the optimal nonparametric rate of convergence. In practice the number of interior knots J_N is chosen according to (4.2). Assumptions (A5) and (A6) involve the inclusion probabilities of the design, which are also assumed in reference [1]. Assumption (A7) is used to derive the design consistency of $\hat{\theta}$ to $\tilde{\theta}$ and Assumption (A8) is used to obtain the rate of the consistency.

3.3 Asymptotic properties of the estimator

The estimator $\hat{\theta}$ in (2.13) of the single-index coefficient θ_0 is asymptotically design consistent as the following theorem demonstrates.

Theorem 1. Under Assumptions (A1)-(A5) and (A7), $\hat{\theta}$ is asymptotically design consistent in the sense that with p -probability 1

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\theta} - \tilde{\theta} = 0,$$

and further if (A8) holds, then

$$\|\hat{\theta} - \tilde{\theta}\|_{\infty} = O_p(J_N/n_N^{1/2}),$$

where $\tilde{\theta}$ and $\hat{\theta}$ are the population and sample based estimators of θ_0 in (2.6) and (2.13).

Like the local polynomial estimators in [1], the following theorem shows that the estimator $\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}$ in (2.15) is asymptotically design unbiased and design consistent.

Theorem 2. Under Assumptions (A1)-(A5) and (A7)-(A8), the model assisted spline estimator $\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}$ in (2.15) is asymptotically design unbiased (ADU) in the sense that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E_p \left[\frac{\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}} - t_y}{N} \right] = 0 \text{ with } \xi\text{-probability 1,}$$

and is design consistent in the sense that for all $\eta > 0$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E_p \left[I_{\{|\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}} - t_y| > N\eta\}} \right] = 0 \text{ with } \xi\text{-probability 1.}$$

Like the local polynomial estimators in [1], the following theorem shows that the estimator in (2.15) also inherits the limiting distribution of the generalized difference estimator.

Theorem 3. Under Assumptions (A1)-(A8), for $\tilde{t}_{y,\text{diff}}$ and $\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}$ in (2.10) and (2.15),

$$\frac{N^{-1}(\tilde{t}_{y,\text{diff}} - t_y)}{\text{Var}_p^{1/2}(N^{-1}\tilde{t}_{y,\text{diff}})} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$ implies

$$\frac{N^{-1}(\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}} - t_y)}{\hat{V}^{1/2}(N^{-1}\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}})} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1),$$

where

$$\hat{V}(N^{-1}\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j \in U_N} (y_i - \hat{m}_i)(y_j - \hat{m}_j) \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i\pi_j}{\pi_i\pi_j} \right) \frac{I_i I_j}{\pi_{ij}}. \quad (3.1)$$

Details of the proofs of Theorems 1-3 are given in Appendix B.

Remark 3.2: In reference [2], the number of knots is fixed, thus the bias caused by spline approximation in developing the asymptotic theory is ignored. It has been shown in many contexts of function estimation that, by letting the number of knots increase with the sample

size at an appropriate rate, spline estimate of an unknown function can achieve the optimal nonparametric rate of convergence; see [22, 34]. For this purpose, in this article, $n_N^{1/6} \ll J_N \ll n_N^{1/5} \{\log(n_N)\}^{-2/5}$, as shown in Assumption (A4).

Remark 3.3: As one referee pointed out, the asymptotics with the number of knots allowed to grow is much more challenging, and only very recent work tackles this problem, e.g. [9, 24]. However, the results obtained in this article are not directly comparable to those obtained in [9, 24] due to different settings of the model. The problem in [9, 24] is a purely nonparametric curve estimation problem and the objective is to study the asymptotics of the curve estimators fitted with penalized splines. While the problem here is a semi-parametric one and the main interest is in estimating the parametric component θ . At the population level, it has been shown that θ_0 should be estimable at the usual root- n rate of convergence using similar techniques as deriving the asymptotics of maximum likelihood estimators. In this article examination of the approximation results of the derivatives (up to the 2nd order) of the risk function in (2.3) by their empirical versions implies that a range of smoothing parameter is allowed for the desired asymptotics; see Appendix A. This differs from nonparametric curve estimation in [9, 24] in which the optimal choice of the smoothing parameter is required to achieve the optimal rate of convergence.

4 Algorithm

In this section, the actual procedure is described to implement the estimation of θ_0 and t_y . I first introduce some new notation. For any fixed θ , write $\mathbf{P}_{\theta,s} = \mathbf{B}_{\theta,s} \left(\mathbf{B}_{\theta,s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{B}_{\theta,s} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{\theta,s}^T \mathbf{W}_s$ as the sample projection matrix onto the cubic spline space. For any $q = 1, \dots, d$, write $\dot{\mathbf{B}}_q = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_q} \mathbf{B}_\theta$, $\dot{\mathbf{P}}_q = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_q} \mathbf{P}_\theta$ as the first order derivatives of $\mathbf{B}_\theta$ and $\mathbf{P}_{\theta,s}$ with respect to θ . Write $\theta_{-d} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{d-1})^T$. Let $\hat{S}^*(\theta_{-d})$ be the score vector of the risk function $\hat{R}^*(\theta_{-d}) = \hat{R} \left(\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{d-1}, \sqrt{1 - \|\theta_{-d}\|_2^2} \right)$, that is, $\hat{S}^*(\theta_{-d}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_{-d}} \hat{R}^*(\theta_{-d})$. The next lemma provides the exact form of $\hat{S}^*(\theta_{-d})$.

Lemma 4.1. *For $\hat{S}^*(\theta_{-d})$, the score vector of $\hat{R}^*(\theta_{-d})$, one has*

$$\hat{S}^*(\theta_{-d}) = -n^{-1} \left\{ \mathbf{y}_s^T \dot{\mathbf{P}}_q \mathbf{y}_s - \theta_q \theta_d^{-1} \mathbf{y}_s^T \dot{\mathbf{P}}_d \mathbf{y}_s \right\}_{q=1}^{d-1}, \quad (4.1)$$

where for any $q = 1, \dots, d$, $\mathbf{y}_s^T \dot{\mathbf{P}}_q \mathbf{y}_s = 2 \mathbf{y}_s^T (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_{\theta,s}) \dot{\mathbf{B}}_q \left(\mathbf{B}_{\theta,s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{B}_{\theta,s} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{\theta,s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{y}_s$, and $\dot{\mathbf{B}}_q = \left\{ J_N \{B_{j,3}(z_{\theta,i}) - B_{j+1,3}(z_{\theta,i})\} \dot{F}_d(\mathbf{x}_{\theta,i}) x_{i,q} \right\}_{i \in s, j=-3, \dots, J}$, with

$$\dot{F}_d(x) = \frac{d}{dx} F_d = \frac{\Gamma(d+1)}{a \Gamma\{(d+1)/2\}^2 2^d} \left(1 - \frac{x^2}{a^2}\right)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} I(|x| \leq a).$$

In practice, the estimation is implemented via the following procedure.

Step 1. *Standardize the auxiliary variables $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \in U_N}$ and find the radius a used in the CDF transformation (2.4) by calculating the $100(1 - \alpha)$ percentile of $\{\|\mathbf{x}_i\|\}_{i \in U_N}$ ($\alpha = 0.01, 0.05$ for example).*

Step 2. *Find the estimator $\hat{\theta}$ of θ_0 by minimizing $\hat{R}$ in (2.12) through the port optimization routine in the technical report of [16], with $(0, 0, \dots, 1)^T$ as the initial value and the gradient vector $\hat{S}^*$ in equation (4.1). If $d < n$, one can take the simple OLS estimator (after standardization) for $\{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \in s}$ with its last coordinate positive.*

Step 3. *Obtain the estimator $\hat{m}_i$ of $m(\mathbf{x}_i)$, $i \in U_N$, by applying formula (2.14).*

Step 4. *Calculate the sample design-based spline estimator of t_y in (2.15).*

Remark 4.1. In Step 2, the number of interior knots is

$$J = \min \left\{ c_1 \left\lceil n^{1/5.5} \right\rceil, c_2 \right\}, \quad (4.2)$$

where c_1 and c_2 are positive integers and $\lceil \nu \rceil$ denotes the integer part of ν . The choice of the tuning parameter c_1 makes little difference for a large sample, and according to our asymptotic theory, there is no optimal way to set these c_1 and c_2 . I recommend using $c_1 = 1$ to save computing for massive data sets and $c_2 = 5, \dots, 10$ for smooth monotonic or smooth unimodal regression as suggested by [37].

5 Empirical Results

In this section, empirical results are provided to demonstrate the applicability of the proposed methodology. A computing package in R can be downloaded from the following website: <http://lilywang.myweb.uga.edu/research.htm>. Besides the spline single-index (SIM) estimators proposed in the article, I have obtained for comparison the performance of three other estimators: Horvitz-Thompson estimator (HT) in equation (1.1), linear regression estimator (LREG) without interaction terms in Chapter 6 of [28], and spline additive estimator (AM) in [2] with degrees 1, 2 and 3 and adaptive knots. The number of knots J_N for the spline SIM estimator is selected according to (4.2).

5.1 Simulated Population

To illustrate the finite-sample behavior of the estimator $\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}$, some simulation results are presented. For the superpopulation model (1.2), the following six mean functions are considered:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{2-dimension (Linear):} \quad & m_1(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 + x_2 \\
\text{2-dimension (Quadratic):} \quad & m_2(\mathbf{x}) = 1 + (x_1 + x_2)^2 \\
\text{2-dimension (Bump 1):} \quad & m_3(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 + x_2 + 4 \exp \left\{ -(x_1 + x_2)^2 \right\} \\
\text{2-dimension (Bump 2):} \quad & m_4(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 + x_2 + 4 \exp \left\{ -(x_1 + x_2)^2 \right\} + \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} \\
\text{4-dimension (Sinusoid):} \quad & m_5(\mathbf{x}) = \sin(\pi \mathbf{x}^T \theta_0), \theta_0 = (1, 1, 0, 1)^T / \sqrt{3} \\
\text{10-dimension (Sinusoid):} \quad & m_6(\mathbf{x}) = \sin(\pi \mathbf{x}^T \theta_0), \theta_0 = (1, 1, 0, \dots, 0, 1)^T / \sqrt{3}
\end{aligned}$$

These represent various correct and incorrect single-index model specifications. Function m_1 is a simple linear additive function with two auxiliary variables, and it is also a linear single-index function; Functions m_2 , m_3 , m_5 and m_6 are some very common single-index models, but unlike m_1 , they are not additive so that the purely linear or additive model would be misspecified. Function m_4 is neither a genuine single-index nor a genuine additive function so that any of the above models would be misspecified. However, because the single-index model in this article is identified by the best approximation (see equation (1.2)) to the multivariate mean function, the estimator $\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}$ is expected to be robust in this case.

The auxiliary vector $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \in U_N}$ is generated from i.i.d uniform $(0, 1)$ random vectors. The population values y_i 's are generated from the mean functions by adding i.i.d $N(0, \sigma^2)$ errors with $\sigma = 0.1$ and 0.4 . The population is of size $N = 1000$. Samples are generated by simple random sampling using sample size $n_N = 50, 100$ and 200 . For each combination of mean function, standard deviation and sample size, 1000 replicates are selected from the same population, the estimators are calculated, and the design bias, design variance and the design mean squared errors are estimated.

Table 1 lists the average mean squared errors (AMSE) of the spline estimators $\hat{\theta}$ in (2.13) based on d dimensions

$$\text{AMSE}(\hat{\theta}) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{q=1}^d \text{MSE}(\hat{\theta}_q), \quad (5.1)$$

from which one sees that, even for small sample size, the estimators $\hat{\theta}$ are very accurate for all the population models, and the precision is improved when sample size n_N increases.

In terms of the design biases, the percent relative design biases

$$\{E_p[\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}] - t_y\} / t_y \times 100\%$$

defined in [1] have been measured for all the above models. It is found that the relative

Table 1: AMSE of the spline estimators $\hat{\theta}$ defined in (5.1).^a

σ	n_N	1	2	3	4	5	6
0.1	50	0.00076	0.0005	0.00027	0.00157	0.00291	0.00482
	100	0.0004	0.00027	0.00014	0.00071	0.0013	0.00226
	200	0.00019	0.00016	0.00008	0.00038	0.0007	0.00124
0.4	50	0.01732	0.00326	0.00504	0.01981	0.00958	0.01427
	100	0.00819	0.00177	0.00257	0.00879	0.00453	0.00696
	200	0.00423	0.00089	0.00129	0.00398	0.00233	0.00372

^aBased on 1000 replications of n_N simple random samples from population of size $N = 1000$.

design biases of the SIM estimators are quite small (less than one percent for all cases in the simulation) even for sample size $n_N = 50$.

Table 2 shows the ratios of design mean squared errors (MSE) for HT, LREG and AM estimators to the MSE for the proposed spline SIM estimator. From this table, one sees that the model-assisted estimators, LREG, AM and SIM estimators, perform much better than the simple HT estimators regardless the type of mean function and standard error. For m_1 , LREG is expected to be the preferred estimator, since the assumed model is correctly specified. The AM and SIM estimators have similar behavior in this case, and the MSE ratios of AM to SIM are close to 1. However, not much efficiency lost by using SIM and AM instead of LREG. The MSE ratios of LREG to SIM are at least 0.78 for all cases. For the rest of the population, the SIM estimators perform consistently better than LREG and AM estimators because the interactions between the auxiliary variables have been completely ignored for LREG and AM estimators. For m_4 , it is not a genuine single-index function, but SIM estimators are still much more accurate than HT, LREG and AM estimators, confirmative to the theory that the proposed estimators are robust against the deviation from single-index model.

To see how fast the computation is, Table 2 provides the average time (based on 1000 replications) of obtaining the SIM estimators on an ordinary PC with Intel Pentium IV 1.86 GHz processor and 1.0 GB RAM. It shows that the proposed SIM estimation is extremely fast. For instance, for Model 6, the SIM estimation of a 10-dimensional sample of size 200 takes on average 0.23 second. I have also carried out the simulation with sample size $n_N = 5000$ generated from the population of size 50000. Remarkably, it takes on average less than 8 seconds to get the SIM estimators for all the above models.

5.2 MU281 data

The MU284 data set from Appendix B of [28] contains data about Swedish municipalities. The study variable y is $\text{RMT85} \times 10^{-3}$, where RMT85 is municipal tax receipts in 1985. Two

Table 2: Ratio of MSE of the HT, LREG and additive model-assisted estimators (AM) to the single-index model-assisted estimators (SIM) and the average computing time of the SIM. ^a

Model	σ	n_N	MSE Ratio					Time of SIM (seconds)
			HT	LREG	AM degree= 1	AM degree= 2	AM degree= 3	
1	0.1	50	12.40	0.78	0.97	1.13	3.05	0.11
		100	14.10	0.88	0.97	0.96	1.02	0.12
		200	14.29	0.90	0.92	0.92	0.95	0.17
	0.4	50	1.15	0.82	1.02	1.19	3.93	0.14
		100	1.74	0.92	1.01	1.01	1.07	0.13
		200	1.72	0.95	0.98	0.97	1.01	0.18
2	0.1	50	35.32	2.75	2.63	3.15	7.32	0.11
		100	41.46	3.48	2.67	2.84	3.19	0.12
		200	43.78	4.44	2.75	2.75	2.82	0.18
	0.4	50	4.03	1.03	1.17	1.36	4.11	0.11
		100	4.62	1.20	1.18	1.20	1.31	0.12
		200	4.65	1.35	1.17	1.16	1.20	0.18
3	0.1	50	34.47	4.24	4.72	5.75	15.53	0.16
		100	39.23	5.38	4.87	5.14	5.56	0.19
		200	42.20	6.82	5.22	5.30	5.36	0.32
	0.4	50	2.98	1.09	1.30	1.53	5.28	0.16
		100	3.36	1.23	1.26	1.28	1.38	0.19
		200	3.80	1.42	1.30	1.30	1.33	0.30
4	0.1	50	10.13	2.88	2.68	3.24	8.17	0.16
		100	11.01	3.50	2.57	2.68	2.86	0.17
		200	12.67	4.63	2.83	2.86	2.88	0.27
	0.4	50	1.59	1.03	1.19	1.40	4.72	0.17
		100	1.80	1.16	1.14	1.15	1.22	0.19
		200	2.10	1.34	1.16	1.16	1.19	0.30
5	0.1	50	18.73	3.51	5.56	8.83	10.79	0.15
		100	25.16	4.42	4.82	5.43	6.67	0.14
		200	29.41	4.97	4.64	4.82	5.02	0.21
	0.4	50	2.54	1.11	1.97	3.43	17.4	0.12
		100	3.08	1.28	1.53	1.63	1.95	0.14
		200	3.43	1.30	1.39	1.41	1.47	0.21
6	0.1	50	8.33	1.63	9.86	7.20	5.26	0.15
		100	13.39	2.21	4.41	5.73	10.53	0.15
		200	18.55	2.90	3.22	3.56	4.09	0.23
	0.4	50	2.08	0.99	6.16	4.59	3.11	0.17
		100	2.63	1.09	2.15	3.01	5.06	0.16
		200	3.20	1.21	1.44	1.59	1.82	0.23

^a Based on 1000 replications of simple random sampling from population of size $N = 1000$.

Table 3: Spline estimators $\hat{\theta}$ on MU281 Data ^a

n_N	θ	MEAN	BIAS	SD	MSE	AMSE
50	θ_1	0.8343	-0.0069	0.0643	0.0468	0.0507
	θ_2	0.5395	-0.0013	0.0940	0.0546	
100	θ_1	0.8412	0.0001	0.0359	0.0465	0.0480
	θ_2	0.5365	-0.0042	0.0563	0.0495	

^a Based on 1000 replications of simple random sampling from population of $N = 281$ Swedish Municipalities.

auxiliary variables x_1 (CS82) and x_2 (SS82) are used, where x_1 is the number of Conservative Party seats in the municipal council, and x_2 is the number of Social Democrat Party seats. The largest three cities according to the variable population in 1975 (pop75) are discarded because they are huge outliers and would be treated separately in practice. The population total of $N = 281$ Swedish Municipalities, t_y , is found to be 53.1510. The “oracle” estimator $\tilde{\theta}$ (see (2.6)) at the population level is found to be $(0.8412, 0.5406)^T$.

A Monte Carlo simulation is carried out in which 1000 repeated SRS samples (each with $n = 50$ and 100) are drawn from the MU281 population of Swedish municipalities. To demonstrate the closeness of the spline estimator $\hat{\theta}$ to the “oracle” index parameter $\tilde{\theta}$, Table 3 lists the sample mean (MEAN), design bias (BIAS), design standard deviation (SD), the design mean squared error (MSE) and the AMSE in (5.1) of $\hat{\theta}$. From this table, one sees that the sample-based estimators $\hat{\theta}$ are very accurate even for sample size 50. As what is expected, when the sample size increases, the coefficient is more accurately estimated. Table 4 shows the performance of the HT, LREG, AM and SIM estimators of t_y . One sees from this table that the model-assisted estimators are much more accurate than the simple HT estimators. Among all the model-assisted estimators, the spline SIM estimators are better than other estimators in terms of the MSE.

Table 4 shows the performance of the HT, LREG, AM and SIM estimators of t_y . One sees from this table that the model-assisted estimators are much more accurate than the simple HT estimators. Among all the model-assisted estimators, the spline SIM estimators are better than other estimators in terms of the MSE.

References

- [1] F.J. Breidt and J.D. Opsomer, *Local polynomial regression estimators in survey sampling*, Ann. Statist. 28 (2000), 1026–1053.
- [2] F.J. Breidt, G. Claeskens and J.D. Opsomer, *Model-assisted estimation for complex surveys using penalised splines*, Biometrika. 92 (2005), 831–846.

Table 4: Estimators of t_y on MU281 Data ^a

n_N	Estimator	MEAN	BIAS	SD	MSE
50	HT	53.0522	-0.0988	7.1936	51.7051
	LREG	52.7476	-0.4034	3.6387	13.3893
	AM (degree = 1)	52.7784	-0.3726	3.8640	15.0539
	AM (degree = 2)	53.1789	0.0279	3.8243	14.6113
	AM (degree = 3)	53.2588	0.1078	4.2464	18.0254
	SIM	52.9247	-0.2264	3.4645	12.0416
100	HT	53.2739	0.1229	4.5926	21.0859
	LREG	52.9646	-0.1864	2.3892	5.7373
	AM (degree = 1)	53.0125	-0.1385	2.4677	6.1026
	AM (degree = 2)	53.1217	-0.0293	2.3538	5.5359
	AM (degree = 3)	53.1197	-0.0313	2.3936	5.7248
	SIM	53.0791	-0.0719	2.3377	5.4646

^a Based on 1000 replications of simple random sampling from population of $N = 281$ Swedish Municipalities.

- [3] F.J. Breidt, J.D. Opsomer, A.A. Johnson and M.G., Ranalli, *Semiparametric model-assisted estimation for natural resource surveys*, Survey Methodology 33 (2007), 35–44.
- [4] R. Carroll, J. Fan, I. Gijbels and M.P. Wand, *Generalized partially linear single-index models*. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 92 (1997), 477–489.
- [5] R.L. Chambers, *Robust case-weighting for multipurpose establishment surveys*. J. Official Statist. 12 (1996), 3–32.
- [6] R.L. Chambers, A.H. Dorfman, and P. HALL, *Properties of estimators of the finite distribution function*, Biometrika 79 (1992), 577–82.
- [7] R.L. Chambers, A.H. Dorfman, and T.E. Wehrly, *Bias robust estimation in finite populations using nonparametric calibration*, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 88 (1993), 268–277.
- [8] R.L. Chambers and C.J. Skinner, *Analysis of Survey Data*, Wiley, Chichester, 2003.
- [9] G. Claeskens, T. Krivobokova and J. Opsomer, *Asymptotic properties of penalized spline regression estimators*. To appear in Biometrika.
- [10] C. de Boor, *A Practical Guide to Splines*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [11] R.A. DeVore and G.G. Lorentz, *Constructive Approximation: Polynomials and Splines Approximation*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993.

- [12] A.H. Dorfman, *Nonparametric regression for estimating totals in finite populations*. Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods. Amer. Statist. Assoc., Alexandria, VA., 1992, pp. 622–625
- [13] A.H. Dorfman and P. Hall, *Estimators of the finite population distribution function using nonparametric regression*, Ann. Statist. 21 (1993), 1452–1475.
- [14] S. Everson-Stewart, *Nonparametric survey regression estimation in two-stage spatial sampling*, unpublished masters project, Colorado State University, available at <http://www.stat.colostate.edu/starmap/everson-stewart.report.pdf>.
- [15] J. Fan and I. Gijbels, *Local Polynomial Modelling and Its Applications*. Chapman and Hall, London, 1996.
- [16] D.M. Gay, *Computing Science Technical Report No. 153: Usage Summary for Selected Optimization Routines*, <http://netlib.bell-labs.com/cm/cs/cstr/153.pdf>.
- [17] P. Hall, *On projection pursuit regression*, Ann. Statist. 17 (1989), 573–588.
- [18] W. Härdle, *Applied Nonparametric Regression*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [19] W. Härdle and P. Hall and H. Ichimura, *Optimal smoothing in single-index models*, Ann. Statist. 21 (1993), 157–178.
- [20] T.J. Hastie and R.J. Tibshirani, *Generalized Additive Models*. Chapman and Hall, London, 1990.
- [21] J.L. Horowitz and W. Härdle, *Direct semiparametric estimation of single-index models with discrete covariates*, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 91 (1996), 1632–1640.
- [22] J.Z. Huang, *Local asymptotics for polynomial spline regression*, Ann. Statist. 31 (2003), 1600–1635.
- [23] C. Isaki and W.A. Fuller, *Survey design under the regression superpopulation model*. J. Am. Statist. Assoc. 77 (1982), 89–96.
- [24] Y. Li and D. Ruppert, *On the asymptotics of penalized splines*, Biometrika, 95 (2008), 415–436.
- [25] O.B. Linton, and J.P. Nielsen, *A Kernel Method of Estimating Structured Nonparametric Regression Based on Marginal Integration*, Biometrika, 82 (1995), 93–101.

- [26] G.E. Montanari and M.G. Ranalli, *Nonparametric model calibration estimation in survey sampling*, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 100 (2005), 1429–1442.
- [27] J.D. Opsomer, F.J. Breidt, G.G. Moisen and G. Kauermann, *Model-assisted estimation of forest resources with generalized additive models (with discussion)*, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 102 (2007), 400–416.
- [28] C.E. Särndal, B. Swensson and J. Wretman, *Model Assisted Survey Sampling*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1992.
- [29] C.E. Särndal and S. Lundström, *Estimation in Surveys with Nonresponse*, Wiley, New York, 2005.
- [30] S. Sperlich, D. Tjøstheim and L. Yang, *Nonparametric estimation and testing of interaction in additive models*, Econometric Theory 18 (2002), 197–251.
- [31] C.J. Stone, *The dimensionality reduction principle for generalized additive models*, Ann. Statist. 14 (1986), 590–606.
- [32] M.E. Thompson, *Theory of Sample Surveys*, Chapman and Hall, London, 1997.
- [33] S. Wang and A. H. Dorfman, *A new estimator for the finite population distribution function*, Biometrika 83 (1997), 639–652.
- [34] L. Wang, and L. Yang, *Spline-backfitted kernel smoothing of nonlinear additive autoregression model*, Ann. Statist. 35 (2007), 2474–2503.
- [35] Y. Xia, W.K., Li, H. Tong and D. Zhang (2004). *A goodness-of-fit test for single-index models*, Statist. Sinica. 14 (2004), 1–39.
- [36] Y. Xia, H. Tong, W.K. Li and L. Zhu, *An adaptive estimation of dimension reduction space*, J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol. 64 (2002), 363–410.
- [37] Y. Yu and D. Ruppert, *Penalized spline estimation for partially linear single index models*, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 97 (2002), 1042–1054.
- [38] H. Zheng and R.J.A. Little, *Penalized spline model-based estimation of finite population total from probability-proportional-to-size samples*, J. Official Statist. 19 (2003), 99–117.
- [39] H. Zheng and R.J.A. Little, *Penalized spline nonparametric mixed models for inference about a finite population mean from two-stage samples*, Survey Methodology 30 (2004), 209–218.

Appendix A. Preliminaries

Let matrices

$$\mathbf{V}_\theta = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{B}_\theta^T \mathbf{B}_\theta, \mathbf{D}_\theta = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{B}_\theta^T \mathbf{y}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The following lemma provides the uniform upper bound of $\|\mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1}\|_\infty$.

Lemma A.1. *Under Assumptions (A1)-(A4), there exist constants $0 < c_V < C_V$ such that with ξ -probability 1*

$$c_V J_N^{-1} \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \leq \mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{V}_\theta \mathbf{w} \leq C_V J_N^{-1} \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2.$$

Consequently, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that with ξ -probability 1

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \|\mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1}\|_\infty \leq C J_N. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The result follows directly from Theorem 5.4.2 of [11] and Assumptions (A1)-(A4), thus omitted.

In the following, let S_c^{d-1} be a cap shape subset of S_+^{d-1} ,

$$S_c^{d-1} = \left\{ (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_d) \mid \sum_{q=1}^d \theta_q^2 = 1, \theta_d \geq c \right\}, c \in (0, 1).$$

Clearly, for an appropriate choice of c , $\theta_0 \in S_c^{d-1}$, which I assume in the rest of the article.

Lemma A.2. *Under Assumptions (A1)-(A5), for $k = 0, 1, 2$*

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \sup_{z \in [0,1]} \left| \frac{\partial^k}{\partial \theta^k} \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z) - \frac{\partial^k}{\partial \theta^k} \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z) \right| = O_p \left(J_N^k / n_N^{1/2} \right), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $\tilde{\varphi}_\theta$ and $\hat{\varphi}_\theta$ are given in (2.8) and (2.11).

Proof. First we show the case when $k = 0$. Let

$$\mathbf{V}_{\theta,\pi} = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{B}_{\theta,s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{B}_{\theta,s}, \mathbf{D}_{\theta,\pi} = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{B}_{\theta,s}^T \mathbf{W}_s \mathbf{y}_s,$$

be the sample version of matrices $\mathbf{V}_\theta$ and $\mathbf{D}_\theta$ in (A.1), then

$$\hat{\varphi}_\theta(z) - \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z) = \mathbf{B}^T(z) \mathbf{V}_{\theta,\pi}^{-1} \mathbf{D}_{\theta,\pi} - \mathbf{B}^T(z) \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \mathbf{D}_\theta \equiv \zeta(\mathbf{V}_{\theta,\pi}, \mathbf{D}_{\theta,\pi}), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

which is a nonlinear function of the following π estimators:

$$v_{\theta,\pi,jj'} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in s} B_{j,4}(z_{\theta i}) B_{j',4}(z_{\theta i}) / \pi_i, d_{\theta,\pi,j} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in s} B_{j,4}(z_{\theta i}) y_i / \pi_i,$$

the components of $\mathbf{V}_{\theta,\pi}$ and $\mathbf{D}_{\theta,\pi}$, respectively. Thus the first order derivative of ζ in (A.4) with respect to $v_{\theta,\pi,jj'}$ and $d_{\theta,\pi,j}$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial v_{\theta,\pi,jj'}} &= \mathbf{B}^T(z) \left(-\mathbf{V}_{\theta,\pi}^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{jj'} \mathbf{V}_{\theta,\pi}^{-1} \right) \mathbf{D}_{\theta,\pi}, -3 \leq j \leq j' \leq J, \\ \frac{\partial \zeta}{\partial d_{\theta,\pi,j}} &= \mathbf{B}^T(z) \mathbf{V}_{\theta,\pi}^{-1} \lambda_j, -3 \leq j \leq J,\end{aligned}$$

where λ_j is a $(J+1)$ -vector with the j th component equal to one, zeros elsewhere; and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{jj'}$ is a $(J+1) \times (J+1)$ matrix with the value 1 in positions (j, j') and (j', j) and the value 0 everywhere else.

Denote the components of $\mathbf{V}_\theta$ and $\mathbf{D}_\theta$ by

$$v_{\theta,jj'} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in U_N} B_{j,4}(z_{\theta i}) B_{j',4}(z_{\theta i}), d_{\theta,j} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in U_N} B_{j,4}(z_{\theta i}) y_i,$$

respectively. Using the Taylor linearization, one can approximate the function ζ in (A.4) by a linear one, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta(\mathbf{V}_{\theta,\pi}, \mathbf{D}_{\theta,\pi}) &= \sum_{j=-3}^J \mathbf{B}^T(z) \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \lambda_j (d_{\theta,\pi,j} - d_{\theta,j}) \\ &- \sum_{-3 \leq j \leq j' \leq J} \mathbf{B}^T(z) (\mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{jj'} \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1}) \mathbf{D}_\theta (v_{\theta,\pi,jj'} - v_{\theta,jj'}) + R_{iN},\end{aligned}$$

where the remainder term

$$\begin{aligned}R_{iN} &= \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z) - \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z) - \sum_{j=-3}^J \mathbf{B}^T(z) \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \lambda_j (d_{\theta,\pi,j} - d_{\theta,j}) \\ &+ \sum_{-3 \leq j \leq j' \leq J} \mathbf{B}^T(z) (\mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{jj'} \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1}) \mathbf{D}_\theta (v_{\theta,\pi,jj'} - v_{\theta,jj'}).\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{B}^T(z) \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \lambda_j (d_{\theta,\pi,j} - d_{\theta,j}) &= \mathbf{B}^T(z) \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \sum_{j=-3}^J \lambda_j (d_{\theta,\pi,j} - d_{\theta,j}) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in U_N} \mathbf{B}^T(z) \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \mathbf{B}_\theta^T e_i y_i \left(\frac{I_i}{\pi_i} - 1 \right),\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{-3 \leq j \leq j' \leq J} \mathbf{B}^T(z) (\mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{jj'} \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1}) \mathbf{D}_\theta (v_{\theta,\pi,jj'} - v_{\theta,jj'}) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in U_N} \left[\mathbf{B}^T(z) \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \left\{ \sum_{-3 \leq j \leq j' \leq J} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{jj'} B_{j,4}(z_{\theta i}) B_{j',4}(z_{\theta i}) \right\} \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \mathbf{D}_\theta \right] \left(\frac{I_i}{\pi_i} - 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in U_N} [\mathbf{B}^T(z) \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \mathbf{B}_\theta^T e_i e_i^T \mathbf{B}_\theta \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \mathbf{D}_\theta] \left(\frac{I_i}{\pi_i} - 1 \right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \sup_{z \in [0,1]} \left| \sum_{j=-3}^J \mathbf{B}^T(z) \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \lambda_j (d_{\theta,\pi,j} - d_{\theta,j}) \right| = O_p \left(n_N^{-1/2} \right),$$

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \left| \sum_{-3 \leq j \leq j' \leq J} \mathbf{B}^T(z) (\mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_{jj'} \mathbf{V}_\theta^{-1}) \mathbf{D}_\theta (v_{\theta,\pi,jj'} - v_{\theta,jj'}) \right| = O_p \left(n_N^{-1/2} \right).$$

Similarly, one can show that

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \sup_{z \in [0,1]} |R_{iN}| = o_p \left(n_N^{-1/2} \right).$$

Thus, (A.3) holds when $k = 0$. Next according to (A.8) in Lemma A.4, the corresponding order on the right hand side of (A.3) will increase by h^{-k} when one takes the k th order derivative of $\mathbf{B}_\theta$. Similar arguments as given above yields the desired results for $k = 1$ and 2 . $\square$

Lemma A.3. *Under Assumptions (A1)-(A5), with p -probability 1, one has*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left| \hat{R}(\theta) - \tilde{R}(\theta) \right| = 0, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left| \frac{\partial^k}{\partial \theta^k} \hat{R}(\theta) - \frac{\partial^k}{\partial \theta^k} \tilde{R}(\theta) \right| = O_p \left(J_N^k / n_N^{1/2} \right), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $\tilde{R}(\theta)$ and $\hat{R}(\theta)$ are the population-based and sample-based empirical risk functions of θ defined in (2.7) and (2.12).

Proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned} A_{N1} &= \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left| N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \left[\{y_i - \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i})\}^2 \left(\frac{I_i}{\pi_i} - 1 \right) \right] \right|, \\ A_{N2} &= \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left| 2N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \{ \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) - \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \} \{y_i - \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i})\} \frac{I_i}{\pi_i} \right|, \\ A_{N3} &= \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left| N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \{ \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) - \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \}^2 \frac{I_i}{\pi_i} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that

$$\hat{R}(\theta) - \tilde{R}(\theta) = N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \left[\{y_i - \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i})\}^2 \frac{I_i}{\pi_i} - \{y_i - \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i})\}^2 \right],$$

one has

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left| \hat{R}(\theta) - R(\theta) \right| \leq A_{N1} + A_{N2} + A_{N3}.$$

Similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 2 entitles that A_{N1} converges to zero with p -probability 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. For A_{N3} , using the similar arguments as in Lemma A.2, one has with p -probability 1

$$\begin{aligned} A_{N3} &= \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left| N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \{ \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) - \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \}^2 \frac{I_i}{\pi_i} \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} \left| N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \{ \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(u) - \hat{\varphi}_\theta(u) \}^2 \right| \frac{1}{\lambda} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

In terms of A_{N2} , note that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{N2} &\leq \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left\{ \left| 2N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \{ \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) - \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \}^2 \frac{I_i}{\pi_i} \right| \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\quad \times \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left\{ \left| 2N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \{ y_i - \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \}^2 \frac{I_i}{\pi_i} \right| \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq 2A_{N3}^{1/2} \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left\{ E_p \left| N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \{ y_i - \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \}^2 \right| \frac{1}{\lambda} \right\}^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The definition of $\tilde{\varphi}_\theta$ in (2.8) implies that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \{ y_i - \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \}^2 < \infty.$$

Thus A_{N2} converges to zero with p -probability 1 as $N \rightarrow \infty$, and (A.5) is proved.

Next note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \hat{R}(\theta) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \tilde{R}(\theta) &= N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \{ y_i - \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \right\} \frac{I_i}{\pi_i} \\ &\quad - N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \{ y_i - \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \right\} \\ &= N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} y_i \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \right\} \frac{I_i}{\pi_i} + N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} y_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \left(\frac{I_i}{\pi_i} - 1 \right) \\ &\quad - N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \left\{ \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \hat{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) - \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \right\} \frac{I_i}{\pi_i} \\ &\quad - N^{-1} \sum_{i \in U_N} \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i}) \left(\frac{I_i}{\pi_i} - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma A.2, the first and the third terms are of the order $O_p\left(J_N^{1+k}/n_N^{1/2}\right)$. Using similar arguments as in Lemma 2 of [1], it can be shown that $\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta}\tilde{\varphi}_\theta(z_{\theta i})$ is bounded if Assumption (A8) holds. the second and the fourth terms are of the order $O_p\left(n_N^{-1/2}\right)$. Thus the desired result in (A.6) holds. $\square$

Lemma A.4. *Under Assumptions (A2), (A4) and (A5), there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that with ξ -probability 1*

$$\sup_{1 \leq p \leq d} \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_p} \mathbf{P}_\theta \right\|_\infty \leq C J_N. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Proof. Note that for any $1 \leq p \leq d$

$$\dot{\mathbf{B}}_p \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_p} \mathbf{B}_\theta = \left[\{B_{j,3}(U_{\theta,i}) - B_{j+1,3}(U_{\theta,i})\} \dot{F}_d(\mathbf{X}_{\theta,i}) h^{-1} X_{i,p} \right]_{i=1, j=-3}^{n, N}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where h is the length of the neighboring knots. For any vector $\mathbf{a} \in R^n$, with probability 1

$$\begin{aligned} \|n^{-1} \mathbf{B}_\theta^T \mathbf{a}\|_\infty &\leq \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \max_{-3 \leq j \leq N} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n B_{j,4}(U_{\theta,i}) \right| \leq Ch \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty, \quad \left\| n^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{B}}_p^T \mathbf{a} \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty \max_{-3 \leq j \leq N} \left| \frac{1}{nh} \sum_{i=1}^n \{(B_{j,3} - B_{j+1,3})(U_{\theta,i})\} \dot{F}_d(\mathbf{X}_{\theta,i}) X_{i,p} \right| \leq C \|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \|n^{-1} \mathbf{B}_\theta^T\|_\infty \leq Ch, \quad \sup_{1 \leq p \leq d} \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \|n^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{B}}_p^T\|_\infty \leq C, \text{ a.s..} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Observing that

$$\dot{\mathbf{P}}_p = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_\theta) \dot{\mathbf{B}}_p (\mathbf{B}_\theta^T \mathbf{B}_\theta)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_\theta^T + \mathbf{B}_\theta (\mathbf{B}_\theta^T \mathbf{B}_\theta)^{-1} \dot{\mathbf{B}}_p^T (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_\theta), \quad (\text{A.10})$$

one only needs to combine (A.2), (A.9), and (A.10) to prove (A.7). $\square$

Appendix B. Proof of Theorems 1-3

B.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{P})$ be the design probability space with respect to the sampling design measure. By Lemma A.3, for any $\delta > 0$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists an integer $N_0(\omega)$, such that when $N > N_0(\omega)$, $\hat{R}(\tilde{\theta}, \omega) - \tilde{R}(\tilde{\theta}) < \delta/2$. Note that $\hat{\theta} = \hat{\theta}(\omega)$ is the minimizer of $\hat{R}(\theta, \omega)$, so $\hat{R}(\hat{\theta}(\omega), \omega) - \tilde{R}(\tilde{\theta}) < \delta/2$. Using Lemma A.3 again, there exists $N_1(\omega)$, such that when $N > N_1(\omega)$, $\tilde{R}(\hat{\theta}(\omega)) - \hat{R}(\hat{\theta}(\omega), \omega) < \delta/2$. Thus, when $N > \max(N_0(\omega), N_1(\omega))$,

$$\tilde{R}(\hat{\theta}(\omega)) - \tilde{R}(\tilde{\theta}) < \delta/2 + \hat{R}(\hat{\theta}(\omega), \omega) - \tilde{R}(\tilde{\theta}) < \delta/2 + \delta/2 = \delta.$$

By Assumption (A7), for any $\varepsilon > 0$, if $\tilde{R}(\hat{\theta}(\omega), \omega) - \tilde{R}(\tilde{\theta}) < \delta$, then one would have $\|\hat{\theta}(\omega) - \tilde{\theta}\|_2 < \varepsilon$ for N large enough, which is true for any ω , and the strong consistency holds.

Next, note that

$$\left. \frac{\partial \hat{R}(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}} - \left. \frac{\partial \hat{R}(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=\tilde{\theta}} = \left. \frac{\partial^2 \hat{R}(\theta)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^T} \right|_{\theta=\bar{\theta}} (\hat{\theta} - \tilde{\theta}),$$

with $\bar{\theta} = \mathbf{t}\hat{\theta} + (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{t})\tilde{\theta}$. So

$$\hat{\theta} - \tilde{\theta} = - \left(\left. \frac{\partial^2 \hat{R}(\theta)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^T} \right|_{\theta=\bar{\theta}} \right)^{-1} \left. \frac{\partial \hat{R}(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=\tilde{\theta}},$$

where according to (A.6) and the above consistency result of $\hat{\theta}$, one has

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left. \frac{\partial^2 \hat{R}(\theta)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^T} \right|_{\theta=\bar{\theta}} \rightarrow \left. \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{R}(\theta)}{\partial \theta \partial \theta^T} \right|_{\theta=\tilde{\theta}}$$

in probability p , and by (A.6) in Lemma A.3, one has

$$\left| \left. \frac{\partial \hat{R}(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right|_{\theta=\tilde{\theta}} \right| \leq \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left| \left. \frac{\partial \hat{R}(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right| - \left. \frac{\partial \tilde{R}(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right| \right| = O_p(J_N/n_N^{1/2}).$$

Thus $\|\hat{\theta} - \tilde{\theta}\|_\infty = O_p(J_N/n_N^{1/2})$ by Assumption (A8).

B.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Lemma B.1. *Under Assumptions (A1)-(A5) and (A7) one has*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} E_p \left[\sum_{i \in U_N} (\tilde{m}_i - \hat{m}_i)^2 \right] = 0,$$

where $\tilde{m}_i$ and $\hat{m}_i$ are defined in (2.9) and (2.14).

Proof. Let $\hat{\tilde{m}}_i = e_i^T \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}} (\mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}}^T \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}})^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}}^T \mathbf{y}$, then one can write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in U_N} (\tilde{m}_i - \hat{m}_i)^2 &= \sum_{i \in U_N} (\tilde{m}_i - \hat{\tilde{m}}_i)^2 + \sum_{i \in U_N} (\hat{\tilde{m}}_i - \hat{m}_i)^2 \\ &+ 2 \sum_{i \in U_N} (\tilde{m}_i - \hat{\tilde{m}}_i) (\hat{\tilde{m}}_i - \hat{m}_i). \end{aligned}$$

According to Lemma A.2, $\frac{1}{N} E_p \left[\sum_{i \in U_N} (\hat{\tilde{m}}_i - \hat{m}_i)^2 \right] \rightarrow 0$, so it suffices to show

$$\frac{1}{N} E_p \left[\sum_{i \in U_N} (\tilde{m}_i - \hat{\tilde{m}}_i)^2 \right] \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Let $f(t) = e_i^T \mathbf{P}_{t\hat{\theta}+(1-t)\tilde{\theta}} \mathbf{y}$, then

$$\frac{df(t)}{dt} = e_i^T \sum_{q=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_q} \mathbf{P}_{t\hat{\theta}+(1-t)\tilde{\theta}} (\hat{\theta}_q - \tilde{\theta}_q) \mathbf{y}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{m}_i - \hat{m}_i &= e_i^T \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}} \left(\mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}}^T \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{\hat{\theta}}^T \mathbf{y} - e_i^T \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\theta}} \left(\mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\theta}}^T \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\theta}} \right)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_{\tilde{\theta}}^T \mathbf{y} \\ &= f(1) - f(0) = e_i^T \sum_{q=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_q} \mathbf{P}_{t^*\hat{\theta}+(1-t^*)\tilde{\theta}} (\hat{\theta}_q - \tilde{\theta}_q) \mathbf{y}, \end{aligned}$$

where $t^* \in (0, 1)$. Thus

$$\frac{1}{N} E_p \left[\sum_{i \in U_N} (\tilde{m}_i - \hat{m}_i)^2 \right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in U_N} E_p \left\{ e_i^T \sum_{q=1}^d \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_q} \mathbf{P}_{t^*\hat{\theta}+(1-t^*)\tilde{\theta}} (\hat{\theta}_q - \tilde{\theta}_q) \mathbf{y} \right\}^2.$$

Note that according to Theorem 1, with p -probability 1,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_q} \mathbf{P}_{t^*\hat{\theta}+(1-t^*)\tilde{\theta}} \rightarrow \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_q} \mathbf{P}_{\tilde{\theta}},$$

and $\|\hat{\theta} - \tilde{\theta}\|_{\infty} = O_p(J_N/n_N^{1/2})$. By Lemma A.4, there exists a positive constant C_0 such that $\sup_{1 \leq k \leq d} \sup_{\theta \in S_c^{d-1}} \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta_k} \mathbf{P}_{\theta} \right\|_{\infty} \leq C_0 J_N$ with ξ -probability 1. Thus (B.1) follows directly from the above arguments and Assumption (A4). Hence the result. $\square$

Note that

$$\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}} - t_y = \sum_{i \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i) \left(\frac{I_i}{\pi_i} - 1 \right) + \sum_{i \in U_N} (\hat{m}_i - \tilde{m}_i) \left(1 - \frac{I_i}{\pi_i} \right).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} E_p \left| \frac{\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}} - t_y}{N} \right| &\leq E_p \left| \sum_{i \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i) \left(\frac{I_i}{\pi_i} - 1 \right) \right| \\ &+ \left\{ E_p \left[\sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{(\hat{m}_i - \tilde{m}_i)^2}{N} \right] E_p \left[\sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{(1 - I_i/\pi_i)^2}{N} \right] \right\}^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

According to the definition of (2.7), under Assumptions (A1)-(A4), one has

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i)^2 < \infty.$$

Following the same argument of Theorem 1 in [1], the first term on the right hand side of (B.2) converges to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. For the second term, Assumption (A5) implies that

$$E_p \left[\sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{(1 - I_i/\pi_i)^2}{N} \right] = \sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{\pi_i (1 - \pi_i)}{N \pi_i^2} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

According to Lemma B.1,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in U_N} E_p \left[(\hat{m}_i - \tilde{m}_i)^2 \right] \rightarrow 0 \text{ with } \xi\text{-probability } 1,$$

and the result follows from the Markov's inequality.

B.3 Proof of Theorem 3

The next lemma is to derive the asymptotic mean squared error of the proposed spline estimator in (2.15).

Lemma B.2. *Under Assumptions (A1)-(A5) and (A7)*

$$n_N E_p \left(\frac{\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}} - t_y}{N} \right)^2 = \frac{n_N}{N^2} \sum_{i,j \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i) (y_j - \tilde{m}_i) \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right) + o(1). \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Proof. Note that

$$\frac{\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}} - t_y}{N} = \sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{y_i - \tilde{m}_i}{N} \left(\frac{I_i}{\pi_i} - 1 \right) + \sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{\hat{m}_i - \tilde{m}_i}{N} \left(\frac{I_i}{\pi_i} - 1 \right).$$

Let

$$a_N = n_N^{1/2} \sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{y_i - \tilde{m}_i}{N} \left(\frac{I_i}{\pi_i} - 1 \right), b_N = n_N^{1/2} \sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{\hat{m}_i - \tilde{m}_i}{N} \left(1 - \frac{I_i}{\pi_i} \right),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} E_p [a_N^2] &= \frac{n_N}{N^2} \sum_{i,j \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i) (y_j - \tilde{m}_i) \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{n_N \max_{i,j \in U_N, i \neq j} |\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j|}{\lambda^2} \right) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i)^2 < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} E_p [b_N^2] &= \frac{n_N}{N^2} E_p \sum_{i,j \in U_N} (\hat{m}_i - \tilde{m}_i) (\hat{m}_j - \tilde{m}_j) \left(1 - \frac{I_i}{\pi_i} \right) \left(1 - \frac{I_j}{\pi_j} \right) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{n_N \max_{i,j \in U_N, i \neq j} |\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j|}{\lambda^2} \right) \frac{1}{N} E_p \left[\{\hat{m}_i - \tilde{m}_i\}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma B.1, one has $E_p [b_N^2] = o(1)$ and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality implies $E_p [a_n b_n] = 0$. Therefore

$$n_N E_p \left(\frac{\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}} - t_y}{N} \right)^2 = E_p [a_n^2] + 2E_p [a_n b_n] + E_p [b_n^2] = E_p [a_n^2] + o(1).$$

Thus the desired result holds. $\square$

Denote by

$$\text{AMSE} (N^{-1} \hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j \in U_N} (y_i - m_i) (y_j - m_j) \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right)$$

as the asymptotic mean squared error in (B.3). The next result shows that it can be estimated consistently by $\hat{V} (N^{-1} \hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}})$ in (3.1).

Lemma B.3. *Under (A1)-(A7), one has*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} n_N E_p \left| \hat{V} (N^{-1} \hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}) - \text{AMSE} (N^{-1} \hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}) \right| = 0.$$

Proof. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i) (y_j - \tilde{m}_j) \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right) \frac{I_i I_j}{\pi_{ij}}, \\ S_2 &= \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{i,j \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i) (\tilde{m}_j - \hat{m}_j) \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right) \frac{I_i I_j}{\pi_{ij}}, \\ S_3 &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j \in U_N} (\tilde{m}_i - \hat{m}_i) (\tilde{m}_j - \hat{m}_j) \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right) \frac{I_i I_j}{\pi_{ij}}, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\hat{V} (N^{-1} \hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}) - \text{AMSE} (N^{-1} \hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}) = S_1 - \text{AMSE} (N^{-1} \hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}}) + S_2 + S_3. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

For the first term S_1 , one has

$$\begin{aligned} & n_N E_p |S_1 - \text{AMSE} (N^{-1} \hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}})| \\ &= \frac{n_N}{N^2} E_p \left| \sum_{i,j \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i) (y_j - \tilde{m}_j) \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right) \frac{I_i I_j - \pi_{ij}}{\pi_{ij}} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{n_N}{N^2} \left\{ E_p \left[\sum_{i,j \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i) (y_j - \tilde{m}_j) \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right) \frac{I_i I_j - \pi_{ij}}{\pi_{ij}} \right]^2 \right\}^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{n_N^2}{N^4} E_p \left[\sum_{i,j \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i) (y_j - \tilde{m}_j) \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right) \frac{I_i I_j - \pi_{ij}}{\pi_{ij}} \right]^2 \\
&= \frac{n_N^2}{N^4} \sum_{i,j,k,l \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i) (y_j - \tilde{m}_j) (y_k - \tilde{m}_k) (y_l - \tilde{m}_l) \\
&\quad \times \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right) \left(\frac{\pi_{kl} - \pi_k \pi_l}{\pi_k \pi_l} \right) E_p \left(\frac{I_i I_j - \pi_{ij}}{\pi_{ij}} \frac{I_k I_l - \pi_{kl}}{\pi_{kl}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{n_N^2}{N^4} \sum_{i,k \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i)^2 (y_k - \tilde{m}_k)^2 \left(\frac{1 - \pi_i}{\pi_i} \right) \left(\frac{1 - \pi_k}{\pi_k} \right) \left(\frac{\pi_{ik} - \pi_i \pi_k}{\pi_{ik}} \right) \\
&+ \frac{2n_N^2}{N^4} \sum_{i \in U_N} \sum_{k \neq l} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i)^2 (y_k - \tilde{m}_k) (y_l - \tilde{m}_l) \left(\frac{1 - \pi_i}{\pi_i} \right) \left(\frac{\pi_{kl} - \pi_k \pi_l}{\pi_{kl}} \right) \\
&\times E_p \left(\frac{I_i - \pi_i}{\pi_i} \frac{I_k I_l - \pi_{kl}}{\pi_{kl}} \right) \\
&+ \frac{n_N^2}{N^4} \sum_{i \neq j, k \neq l} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i) (y_j - \tilde{m}_j) (y_k - \tilde{m}_k) (y_l - \tilde{m}_l) \\
&\times \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right) \left(\frac{\pi_{kl} - \pi_k \pi_l}{\pi_k \pi_l} \right) E_p \left(\frac{I_i I_j - \pi_{ij}}{\pi_{ij}} \frac{I_k I_l - \pi_{kl}}{\pi_{kl}} \right) \\
&\equiv s_{1N} + s_{2N} + s_{3N}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{1N} &\leq n_N^2 \sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{(y_i - \tilde{m}_i)^4}{\lambda^3 N^4} + n_N^2 \sum_{i,k \in U_N} \frac{(y_i - \tilde{m}_i)^2 (y_k - \tilde{m}_k)^2 |\pi_{ik} - \pi_i \pi_k|}{\lambda^4 N^4} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{n_N^2}{\lambda^3 N^3} + n_N^2 \frac{\max_{i,k \in U_N, i \neq k} |\pi_{ik} - \pi_i \pi_k|}{\lambda^4 N^2} \right) \sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{(y_i - \tilde{m}_i)^4}{N},
\end{aligned}$$

and $\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i)^4 < \infty$. Thus s_{1N} goes to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Next

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{3N} &\leq \frac{(n_N \max_{i,k \in U_N, i \neq k} |\pi_{ik} - \pi_i \pi_k|)^2}{\lambda^4 \lambda^{*2}} \\
&\times \frac{1}{N^4} \sum_{i \neq j, k \neq l} |(y_i - \tilde{m}_i) (y_j - \tilde{m}_j) (y_k - \tilde{m}_k) (y_l - \tilde{m}_l)| E_p \left| \frac{I_i I_j - \pi_{ij}}{\pi_{ij}} \frac{I_k I_l - \pi_{kl}}{\pi_{kl}} \right| \\
&\leq O(N^{-1}) + \frac{(n_N \max_{i,k \in U_N, i \neq k} |\pi_{ik} - \pi_i \pi_k|)^2}{\lambda^4 \lambda^{*2}} \\
&\quad \times \max_{(i,j,k,l) \in D_{4,N}} \left| E_p \left[\left(\frac{I_i I_j - \pi_{ij}}{\pi_{ij}} \right) \left(\frac{I_k I_l - \pi_{kl}}{\pi_{kl}} \right) \right] \right| \sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{(y_i - \tilde{m}_i)^4}{N},
\end{aligned}$$

which converges to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by Assumption (A6). As a result of Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, one can show s_{2N} goes to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore

$$n_N E_p |S_1 - \text{AMSE}(N^{-1} \hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}})| \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Next for S_2 , by Lemma B.1

$$\begin{aligned} & n_N E_p \left| \frac{2}{N^2} \sum_{i,j \in U_N} (y_i - \tilde{m}_i) (\tilde{m}_j - \hat{m}_j) \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right) \frac{I_i I_j}{\pi_{ij}} \right| \\ & \leq \left(\frac{2n_N \max_{i,k \in U_N, i \neq k} |\pi_{ik} - \pi_i \pi_k|^2}{\lambda^4 \lambda^{*2}} + \frac{2n_N}{\lambda^2 N} \right) \sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{(y_i - \tilde{m}_i)^2}{N} \\ & \times \sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{E_p (\tilde{m}_i - \hat{m}_i)^2}{N} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

For S_3 , applying Lemma B.1 again, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & E_p |n_N S_3| = \frac{n_N}{N^2} E_p \left| \sum_{i,j \in U_N} (\tilde{m}_i - \hat{m}_i) (\tilde{m}_j - \hat{m}_j) \left(\frac{\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j}{\pi_i \pi_j} \right) \frac{I_i I_j}{\pi_{ij}} \right| \\ & \leq \left(\frac{n_N \max_{i,j \in U_N, i \neq j} |\pi_{ij} - \pi_i \pi_j|}{\lambda^2 \lambda^*} + \frac{n_N}{\lambda^2 N} \right) \frac{1}{N} E_p \left[\sum_{i \in U_N} (\tilde{m}_i - \hat{m}_i)^2 \right] \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

The desired result follows from (B.4)-(B.7). $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3: By the proof of Lemma B.2,

$$\begin{aligned} N^{-1} (\hat{t}_{y,\text{diff}} - t_y) &= N^{-1} \left(\sum_{i \in s} \frac{y_i - \hat{m}_i}{\pi_i} + \sum_{i \in U_N} \hat{m}_i - \sum_{i \in U_N} \frac{y_i I_i}{\pi_i} \right) \\ &= N^{-1} (\tilde{t}_{y,\text{diff}} - t_y) + o_p(n_N^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

so the desired result follows from Lemma B.3. $\square$